



Greater Norwich Local Plan Examination

Matter 9 Hearing Statement

February 2022



gladman.co.uk



01260 288888

Page intentionally left blank

MATTER 9 – RESIDENTIAL BASED ALLOCATIONS

Issue 4 – Costessey Contingency Site (ref GNLP0581/2043)

Q1 Is the allocation justified and is it supported by the evidence?

- 1.1.1 Gladman do not support the allocation of a contingency site at Costessey and do not believe the allocation is justified.
- 1.1.2 The Regulation 18 Draft GNLP included the potential provision of a contingency site around Wymondham for the delivery of up to 1,000 dwellings. Gladman note that the regulation 19 GNLP has removed the reference to a potential contingency site around the edge of Wymondham without providing justification for its removal.
- 1.1.3 In our representations to earlier iterations of the GNLP, Gladman questioned the inclusion of a contingency site around Costessey as opposed to Wymondham. In the Partnership's Response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions, it is stated that '*Costessey was identified as the most appropriate contingency site at the publication stage of plan making due to its location adjacent to developing urban extensions in Costessey and at Bowthorpe on the edge of the urban area*'. However, Gladman contends that this is not an appropriate approach to identifying a location for a contingency site. If the market is failing to deliver homes around the edge of Norwich, providing further land for residential development in the same location will not solve the matter. Taking this into consideration Gladman proposes that the inclusion of land around Wymondham, where much needed education capacity can be provided on site, should be included within the GNLP.

Q3 Is the land required in order to deliver a safe and suitable access into the site available?

- 1.1.4 Gladman has not seen any evidence submitted through the regulation 19 process which demonstrates that a suitable access can be achieved to facilitate the delivery of the site. We are aware that there are potentially issues surrounding landownership which may impact the ability of the site to be delivered and we have not seen any

evidence which confirms that the issue has been addressed. There is no SoCG available to view in respect of this site, the latest position on the examination website states that '*a SoCG is currently being negotiated*'. In this regard, Gladman submits that further growth should be allocated to the Main Towns and Key Service Centres to ensure the housing need figure is delivered and to allow for greater flexibility. Offering a wider variety of sites to the market in varied locations across the Greater Norwich area will provide greater certainty that the housing requirement will be met.

Q4 Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed? Would the requirement to provide new educational facilities within the site affect its ability to meet other policy requires, e.g., for affordable housing?

1.1.5 Gladman is not aware that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate the deliverability of the contingency site in its entirety. Gladman submits that the site we are promoting at Norwich Common, Wymondham would be a more suitable alternative for inclusion as a contingency site. An outline planning application has been submitted by Gladman to South Norfolk Council and the technical information submitted with the application demonstrates that there are no constraints which would prohibit the development of the site. As part of the application, Gladman has offered land for education and other community uses as part of the development.